

**Remarks:**

Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are allowed. The present Amendment of claims 12-14 clearly places the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected because claim 12 depended from claims 1-11 whereas claim 4 had been canceled. Claim 12 is now amended to depend from claims 1 to 3 and 5 to 11, thereby removing the basis of the \$112 rejection of claims 12 and 13.

In the Office Action, the \$103 claim rejection followed by the "Response to Arguments" ends with the following sentence at the top of page 4: "However, Applicant's arguments do not apply to Claim 14 given that Claim 14 does not require the hydrophilic copolyester to be the same as claimed in Claim 1 and argued by the Applicant as providing unexpected results."


Claim 14 is amended by replacing the term "hydrophilic copolyester" with the identical definition of a polyester which was inserted into claim 1 by the Amendment filed on April 16, 2009.

The rejection of claim 14 under \$103 as being obvious over the Shimizu et al reference is respectfully traversed in view of the detailed arguments set forth in applicants' Amendment filed April 16, 2009, starting with the last complete paragraph on page 6 and continuing through page 9, line 2. It is respectfully

submitted that the presently amended claim 14 is not rendered obvious by the Shimizu et al disclosure.

Entry of the present Amendment and allowance is solicited, taking into consideration that the amendment effectuates inherent suggestions in the Office Action which would lead to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

  
HERBERT GOODMAN  
Reg. No. 17,081

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman  
& Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Ave., 16th floor  
New York, NY 10001-7708  
Telephone: (212) 319-4900  
Facsimile: (212) 319-5101

HG/lpv